REMARKS:

1) Referring to item 10) of the Office Action Summary, please indicate the acceptance of the drawings filed on August 19, 2003.

2) Entry of this Response after Final is respectfully requested. The present amendment does not introduce more claims. The present amendment merely further clarifies the intended meaning of the prior subject matter of claim 1, in view of the further explanation provided by the Examiner in the Final Office Action. With this clarification, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are allowable, for the reasons to be discussed below. Accordingly, entry and consideration of this Response after Final are respectfully requested.

3) Claim 1 has been amended to expressly recite that the locking member is displaceably supported on the carriage body (which was already inherent from lines 11 to 16 of prior claim 1), and to make clear that the locking member engages with an engagement portion provided on the carriage body (which was inherent from lines 3 and 4 of prior claim 1). Thus, the present clarifying amendment does not introduce any new matter. Entry and consideration thereof are respectfully requested.

4) Referring to the bottom of page 3 of the Office Action, the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 4 and 5 is appreciated. These claims have been maintained without further amendment, and thus still define allowable subject matter.

Furthermore, for the reasons to be discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is also patentable over the prior art.

5) Referring to pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the rejection of claims 1 to 3 as anticipated by US Patent 4,819,958 (Perego) is respectfully traversed.

6) The Examiner's further remarks at pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action are appreciated. It is acknowledged that applicant's prior arguments regarding the tongue element (158) did not directly address the Examiner's position regarding the engagement pin (134). Rather, the arguments about the tongue element (158) were intended to address another aspect or interpretation of the reference that might have been applied against the claims, because the tongue element (158) of the reference is arranged to selectively block movement of the locking member (135). Moreover, applicant's prior arguments also did directly address the Examiner's position regarding the "stopper" (134) (see the second to last paragraph on page 14 of the prior Response).

7) Applicant's discussion of the Perego reference in the prior Response is incorporated herein and reasserted.

8) A prior art reference anticipates a claim only if it discloses (or inherently includes) every element recited in the claim. That is not the case here, in view of the following significant differences between the disclosure of Perego and present claim 1.

If the hand grip (155) is considered as the present "operating member", and the slider with a hook (135, 133) is regarded as the present "open-state locking member", then the pin (134) must be regarded as the presently claimed "engagement portion provided on said carriage body". Namely, the open-state locking member (135) is displaceable between a locked position (Figs. 1, 2) in which the locking member (135) is engaged with the engagement portion (134) so as to lock an open state of the baby carriage into a locked condition, and an unlocked position (Figs. 3, 4) in which the locking member (135) is separated from the engagement portion (134) so as to release the locked condition in the open state of the baby carriage (Figs. 3, 4). The operating member (155) is arranged and adapted to move the locking member (135) from the locked position (Figs. 1, 2) to the unlocked position (Figs. 3, 4).

However, with the above understanding of Perego in comparison to present claim 1, Perego has no stopper as defined in present claim 1. Particularly, no element of the Perego structure is moveably provided on a body member of the carriage body so as to be **moveable relative to the body member** between a first position and a second position, whereby the stopper in the first position contacts the locking member (135) to **prohibit movement of the locking member out of the locked position**, and whereby the stopper in the second position is separate from the locking member to allow movement of the locking member to the unlocked position. To the contrary, it is readily apparent that the locking member (135) remains freely moveable without any blocking or obstruction, simply by pulling or moving the

operating member (155) to selectively move the locking member (135) from the locked position (Figs. 1, 2) to the unlocked position (Figs. 3, 4). There is no element like the presently claimed stopper that can be moved into a first position in which this stopper prohibits movement of the locking member out of the locked position.

Furthermore, even if one does not analogize the pin (134) to the presently claimed "engagement portion", but rather analogizes the pin (134) to the presently claimed "stopper" as proposed by the Examiner, then there are even more drastic differences between the prior art and the present claim, as follows.

The alleged stopper or pin (134) is **not** "moveably provided on a body member of said carriage body so as to be . . . moveable relative to said body member". To the contrary, the pin (134) is fixed to and protrudes from the body member or handle-bar (113) (see col. 2 lines 27 to 28).

The alleged stopper or pin (134) is **not** moveable to a first position in which the pin (134) prohibits movement of the open-state locking member (135) out of the locked position (Figs. 1, 2). To the contrary, in the open state of the baby carriage, it is correct that the pin (134) is in contact with the locking member (135, 133) in order to establish the locked condition in the open state of the baby carriage (col. 2 lines 24 to 50). But in this position in which the pin (134) contacts the locking member (135, 133) it is clear that the pin (134) does **not** block or otherwise prohibit movement of the locking member out of the locked position. To the contrary, the locking member (135, 133)

can be freely moved out of the locked position (Fig. 1, 2) to the unlocked position (Figs. 3, 4) simply by sliding the hand grip (155) without any sort of blocking or prohibiting of this motion by the pin (134). The locking member (135, 133) is free to slide out of contact and engagement with the pin (134) (see col. 2 lines 24 to 34 and 57 to 66).

The Examiner has asserted that the transition from Figs. 1 or 3 to Fig. 5 demonstrates movement of the pin (134) from its first position to a second position in which the pin (134) is separate from the locking member (135, 133). However, this "movement" is **not** a movement of the pin (134) relative to the body member (113) on which it is provided. To the contrary, as pointed out above, the pin (134) is fixed to that body member (113) and does not move relative to it.

Also, the "second position" of the pin (134) shown in Fig. 5, has nothing to do with allowing movement of the locking member (135, 133) to its unlocked position. To the contrary, the locking member (135, 133) must **already** be in its unlocked position (Figs. 3, 4) in order to release and permit the pin (134) to move away from the open state (Figs. 1 to 4) to the folded state (Fig. 5) of the baby chair. From the transition from Figs. 1 and 2 to Figs. 3 and 4, it is clear that the pin (134) is in its "first position" and not in its second position (Fig. 5) in order to allow movement of the locking member (135) from its locked position (Figs. 1, 2) to its unlocked position (Figs. 3, 4).

As pointed out by the Examiner on page 4 of the Office Action, "*The locking member (135) must be manually released by*

*a user*". This serves to disengage the locking member (135) from the pin (134).

The Examiner next argues "*Clearly, if the stop (134) prevents movement of the locking member (135) to an un-locked position* ....". That premise of the Examiner's argument is respectfully traversed as factually incorrect. The pin (134) does not prevent movement of the locking member (135) out of the locked position to the unlocked position, because, as explained above, the locking member (135) freely slides to the unlocked position when the user manually pulls the hand grip (155) so as to slidingly disengage the locking member (135) from the pin (134). The pin does not prevent such movement of the locking member.

The Examiner's argument continues " ... *until a user manually releases the stop*". That aspect of the Examiner's argument is respectfully traversed as factually incorrect. As pointed out by the Examiner, the user manually releases or disengages the locking member (135) by pulling the hand grip (155). The user does not manually release the stop (134). The user does not do anything to the pin (134), which always remains fixed to the handle-bar (113).

In view of the configuration and arrangement of the parts, it is clear that the pin (134) is not in any way blocking, impeding, obstructing, or bringing to a halt, the sliding motion of the locking member (135) from its locked position (Figs. 1, 2) to its unlocked position (Figs. 3, 4).

9) For the above reasons, Perego does not anticipate claim 1. The dependent claims recite additional features that further distinguish the invention over the prior art. For example, regarding present claim 2, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the hook (133) of Perego does not correspond to a "forcing means for forcing said stopper to be brought to said first position". To the contrary, the hook (133) is an integral unitary component of the locking member (135) and it does not have any function of forcing the pin (134) to be brought to a first position (or any position) thereof (see col. 2 lines 29 to 32 and 51 to 66).

10) The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 1 to 3 as anticipated by Perego.

11) Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application, including all present claims 1 to 5, are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Kenzou KASSAI et al.
Applicant

By _____
Walter F. Fasse
Patent Attorney
Reg. No.: 36132
Tel. 207-862-4671
Fax. 207-862-4681
P. O. Box 726
Hampden, ME 04444-0726

WFF:he/4564
Enclosures:
Transmittal Cover Sheet

CERTIFICATE OF FAX TRANSMISSION:
I hereby certify that this correspondence with all indicated enclosures is being transmitted by telefax to (571) 273-8300 on the date indicated below, and is addressed to: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450.

_____ 2/3/06
Name: Walter F. Fasse - Date: February 3, 2006